



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,125	07/07/2003	Kyung-Hun Jang	249/387	7220
27849 7590 03/06/2008 LEE & MORSE, P.C. 3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE SUITE 500 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042				
EXAMINER SHAN, APRIL YING				
ART UNIT 2135		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 03/06/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

Applicant's amendment is entered. Therefore, the examiner withdraws the 112 second rejections. Applicant's arguments filed on February 5, 2008 have been respectfully and fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments are summarized as:

- a. In the Asokan et al. reference, the P5 session key is modified for each new session and is discarded at the end of that session, e.g., after an undetermined time period
- b. Dependent claims are allowable due to dependency

In response to argument 'a', the examiner respectfully traverses. It appears that the Applicant is not interpreting the previous office action as intended by the examiner. Firstly, the examiner acknowledges that the Applicant's statement on page 11 of the remark, "session key in the Asokan et al. reference...is generated **for each communication session** and then discarded...the session key is modified for each new session and is discarded at the end of that session." Second, in the Applicant's original disclosure, for example paragraph [0026], "...key...is used only during a predetermined time period, and is discarded after the time period expires". Further, the Applicant's disclosure does not explicitly define the term "predetermined time period". Therefore, the term should be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. The term should not be limited to preferred embodiments in the specification. The word should take on the ordinary and customary meaning attributed to it by those of ordinary skill in

the art. See *In re ACTV, Inc. v. The Walt Disney Company*, 346 F.3d 1082, 1092, 68 USPQ2d 1516, 1524 (Fed. Cir. 2003) and *In re E-Pass Technologies, Inc. v. 3Com Corporation*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1368, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1949 (Fed. Cir. 2003). It is well known in the art and agreed by the Applicant, a session key is a key that is just used for one meeting/session and a session key is modified for a new meeting/session. Now, let us look at Asokan et al. reference, under 1 Introduction, 1.1 A new key agreement scenario, "...for an ad-hoc **meeting**..." is disclosed. It is well known in the art, in order to call a meeting/session, a predetermined time period must be set before the meeting/session for the sake of the sharing resources, such as conference rooms' availability, network session availability and participant's available time and etc. It cannot be undetermined time period as argued by the Applicant since the meeting/session resources need to be shared and the participants need to make sure they are available during the meeting/session.

In response to argument 'b', the examiner respectfully traverses. Applicant's argument for claims 1, 12, 21 and 23 as discussed above are traversed and therefore, the Applicant's arguments for dependent claims are based on dependency on claims 1, 12, 21 and 23 are traversed and it is not allowable.

Therefore, because of the above facts, the examiner maintains the rejections for claims 1-5, 7-18 and 20-25.

/Thanhnga B. Truong/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2135